

# CHECKLIST

## For Reviewing

### Supplemental Educational Services Provider Applications

Applicant Name \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This reviewer checklist was adopted from the *SEA Toolkit on Supplemental Educational Services* developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the Education Quality Institute (EQI)

## A. EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Evidence of positive impact on student achievement is the primary concern of the *No Child Left Behind* Act and is most critical to consumers of supplemental services. Less powerful indicators of effectiveness include evidence of positive impact on school grades, student discipline, student attendance, retention/promotion rates, and/or family/parent satisfaction. SEAs should consider an SSP's evidence of improvement in these areas, but this evidence should be considered of secondary importance to evidence of improved student achievement in reading and math (and science in 2005) as demonstrated by performance on valid and reliable assessments.

SSPs should also be able to demonstrate success with students who are similar in prior achievement levels and demographics to those students who will be served under the supplemental services provisions of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Particular student populations to be considered include: low achieving, low-income, minority, migrant, limited English proficient, and special education students.

SSPs must provide evidence in at least 2 of the categories below in order to be approved.

A. Evidence of Effectiveness <i>(Limit 2 pages)</i>	Quality of Evidence			
	STRONG evidence	MODERATE evidence	LIMITED evidence	NO evidence
1. The provider demonstrates positive impact on student achievement for low-income, underachieving students on a state, district and/or another independent, valid and reliable performance test				

2. The provider demonstrates positive impact on student performance using a measure that is not national or statewide (i.e. provider developed test) <u>OR</u> using school grades, homework completion, or school/teacher administered subject area test.				
3. The provider submits strong referrals: Letters from previous clients (families, schools, districts, students, teachers, etc.) offering testimonial information on the positive impact of the program (min. 5 letters, max. 10).				
4. The provider demonstrates additional evidence of improved outcomes, such as student attendance, retention/promotion rates, graduation rates, family/parent satisfaction, and/or student discipline.				

***Reviewer Comments – Evidence of Effectiveness:***

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**Item 3:**

**Item 4:**

**General:**

## B. LINKS BETWEEN RESEARCH & PROGRAM DESIGN

The *No Child Left Behind* Act requires SEAs to ensure that all supplemental services provided are “research-based.” While the SEA’s primary considerations should focus on whether the SSP can demonstrate positive effects on student achievement (Section A above), consumers of supplemental services considering taking a chance on a program with a weaker evidence of effectiveness may want to know if the provider can clearly explain the theoretical/empirical rationale behind major elements of its program. A newer or very small SSP may not have had sufficient time or finances to conduct research on its effectiveness, but that provider ought to be able to clearly demonstrate that its program *can* work: i.e., that it was built based on solid evidence on what works. Of course, over time an SSP must demonstrate that it *does* work.

Interpretations of the term research-based can vary wildly, and evaluating a program’s research-base can be a huge undertaking. To approach this task in a straightforward and transparent manner, SEAs should require SSPs to clearly and explicitly demonstrate the links between research-based practice and major instructional components of their program. SEAs can then evaluate an SSP’s research base by examining the extent to which that provider is able to cite quality research studies that provide rationale and evidence for the key instructional practices and major design elements of their program. To the extent known, reviewers should indicate the quality of cited research.

Note that the preliminary guidance on SSPs states, “Providers shall not be disqualified on the grounds that their documentation of instructional strategies does not include ‘scientifically based research’ (as such term is defined in the NCLBA).” This does not mean that you should not use scientifically based research as an indicator of quality, simply that SSPs cannot be *disqualified* because they cannot provide a research base to support their instructional strategies.

**For SSPs that offer reading instruction, the findings of the National Reading Panel must be addressed by the program design.**

B. Evidence of Links Between Research & Program Design <i>(Limit 1 page)</i>	Quality of Evidence			
	STRONG evidence	MODERATE evidence	LIMITED evidence	NO evidence
1. The provider can clearly and specifically explain the theoretical/empirical rationale behind major elements of its program (research citations must be included).				

	Stongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Research not known
2. The research citations provided are of high quality.				

*Reviewer Comments:*

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

## C. CONNECTION TO STATE AND DISTRICT(S') ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The *No Child Left Behind Act* requires supplemental educational services to be consistent with the instructional program(s) of the district(s) and with state academic content standards. SEAs should use this checklist to evaluate how clearly and specifically an SSP can demonstrate a connection to specific state standards and the district(s') instructional program(s).

**SSPs must provide evidence in both the categories below in order to be approved.**

<b>C. Connection to State Academic Standards and District(s') Instructional Program(s)</b> <i>(Limit 1 page)</i>	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. The provider can clearly and specifically demonstrate a connection to specific state standards.				
2. The provider can clearly and specifically demonstrate a connection with the instructional program(s) of the district(s) in which the provider intends to operate. If the program differs from the district's prevailing instructional or curricular approach, the provider must explain why it differs and how it meets student academic needs.				

*Reviewer Comments:*

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**General:**

## D. MONITORING STUDENT PROGRESS

To ensure that approved SSPs offer quality programs that will meet the needs of students served, SEAs should consider the specific programs and practices an SSP uses to (1) diagnose a student's needs, (2) prescribe an instructional program to meet that student's needs, and (3) evaluate and monitor the student's progress towards clearly identified goals. The presence of programs and practices that diagnose problems and monitor student progress is an indicator of quality.

**SSPs must provide evidence in all three of the categories below in order to be approved.**

<b>D. Monitoring Student Progress</b> <i>(Limit 1 page)</i>	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. The provider uses a clearly defined process to assess/diagnose student needs, identify skill or knowledge gaps, and prescribe an instructional program based on the student's individual needs.				
2. The provider evaluates, monitors, and tracks student progress on a continuous and regular basis.				
3. The provider develops a timetable for each student's achievement progress that includes clear goals for the student.				

***Reviewer Comments:***

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**Item 3:**

## E. COMMUNICATION WITH SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

An approved SSP should be able to demonstrate a clear link between the academic program a student experiences in the regular school day, and the instruction and content of the supplemental education program. To ensure instructional and cognitive consistency for the child, an approved SSP should have clear, consistent communication on the student's progress with that student's teachers and appropriate school or district staff. SSP applicants should clearly explain the methods, tools, and processes they use to communicate student progress to schools and should specifically explain how they ensure a connection between the school program and their own services.

**SSPs must provide evidence in both the categories below in order to be approved.**

<b>E. Communication with Schools and Districts</b> (Limit 1 page)	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. The provider ensures a connection between their instructional program and the program in place at the student's school.				
2. The provider consistently and clearly reports on student progress to the student's teachers and appropriate school or district staff.				

***Reviewer Comments:***

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**General:**

## F. COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS: OVERVIEW

The *No Child Left Behind* Act requires SSPs to provide parents of children enrolled in a supplemental education program with information on the progress of their child in increasing achievement (in the particular skill/knowledge the SSP was designed to develop) in a format and language that parents can understand. SEAs should ask applicant SSPs to clearly explain what methods, tools, and processes they use to communicate student progress to their students' parents and/or families.

SSPs must provide evidence in at least two of the categories below in order to be approved.

F. Communication with parents (Limit 1 page)	Quality of Evidence			
	STRONG evidence	MODERATE evidence	LIMITED evidence	NO evidence
1. The provider consistently and clearly reports on student progress to the student's parents.				
2. The provider clearly explains its services to parents and involves parents in creating a timetable/goals for their child's academic progress.				
3. The provider works to accommodate the needs and schedules of working parents.				
4. The provider has established a fair, consistent process for resolving any disputes or conflicts between parents and the provider.				
5. If parents are required to participate in the service provided, the provider clearly explains the parent's expected contribution.				
6. Provider staff is trained to work with parents.				
7. The provider has capacity in speaking or translating information into other languages.				

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Item # \_\_\_:**

**Item # \_\_\_:**

## G. QUALIFICATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

SEAs may choose to consider the following information as indicators of staff qualifications:

- ✓ The amount and quality of training provided to program staff to deliver the program;
- ✓ Years and level of work experience, particularly in working with Title I students;
- ✓ Highest degree attained; and/or
- ✓ Certification.

Overall, SEAs should consider the evidence on staff qualifications provided by the SSP and should look for both demonstrated successful experience as well as evidence that the SSP is committed to ongoing professional development and improvement of its own products and services.

SSPs must provide evidence in at least two of the categories below in order to be approved.

<b>G. Qualifications of Instructional Staff</b> <i>(Limit 1 page)</i>	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. Staff is qualified to provide high quality supplemental services. (See below for a list of indicators of staff qualifications.)				
2. Staff demonstrates adequate experience in working with Title I students.				
3. Staff participates in ongoing professional development to improve its instruction, products, and services.				
4. The SSP recruits and hires high quality staff, offers ongoing training opportunities, and regularly reviews staff performance.				

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Item # \_\_\_\_:**

**Item # \_\_\_\_:**



## H. FINANCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

The *No Child Left Behind* Act requires that the SEA's criteria for identifying approved SSPs must include "evidence that the provider is financially sound." Education consumers need to know that the program provider in which they choose to "invest" has the financial capacity to sustain quality services and support to all its students. These indicators can help SEAs evaluate a program provider's capacity to deliver quality services over time and at scale.

There are a number of ways an SSP applicant might prove that it is financially and organizationally sound, and the acceptable evidence will vary depending on the initial size and capacity of the provider. Individuals applying to be an SSP will possess different financial and management structures, for example, than large companies applying to be an SSP. SEAs should take these differences into account when reviewing applications.

Evidence of acceptable financial and management capacity might include:

- ✓ Copies of business license or formal documentation of legal status with respect to conducting business in the state (and district(s), if applicable);
- ✓ Contracts, warranties, or guaranties for services provided;
- ✓ Proof of liability insurance (company name and policy number, or a copy of the policy cover page);
- ✓ A description of how the provider currently receives funds (i.e. grants, fees-for-service, etc.);
- ✓ Audited financial statements;
- ✓ Credit ratings from an independent rating agency;
- ✓ Business plans or profiles that might include: goals, timelines and expected outcomes; detailed action steps; descriptions of financial and staff resources; organizational budgets that accounts for revenues and expenses and cash flow activity; and outlines of roles and responsibilities of staff within the organization;
- ✓ Descriptions of an experienced management team (e.g. CEO, CFO, COO, Marketing Director, Director of Staff Development, etc.) and senior staff members who help set direction and maintain a leadership system; or
- ✓ Samples or descriptions of formal contract, data collection, accounting, and communications processes and systems.

**SSPs must provide evidence of effectiveness in point 1 below and at least one other category in order to be approved.**

<b>H. Financial and Organizational Capacity</b> <i>(Limit 1 page)</i>	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. The provider is financially sound.				
2. The provider has a sound management structure.				
3. The provider possesses adequate organizational resources to meet consumer demand.				
4. The provider issues contracts, warranties, or guaranties for services provided.				
5. The provider maintains formal contract, data collection, accounting, and communications processes and systems.				

***Reviewer Comments:***

**Item 1:**

**Item #\_\_\_:**

**Item #\_\_\_:**

**Item # \_\_\_:**

# I. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL HEALTH & SAFETY STANDARDS

All approved SSPs must comply with federal, state and local health and safety standards. SEAs should include any indicators specific to their state or district(s) legal requirements for health and safety.

SSPs must respond to all the categories below in order to be approved.

I. Compliance with Federal, State and Local Health & Safety Standards <i>(Limit ½ page)</i>	Quality of Evidence			
	STRONG evidence	MODERATE evidence	LIMITED evidence	NO evidence
1. The provider conducts criminal background checks on all employees before hiring. <i>Note: SEAs should check a YES or NO.</i>	? Yes			? No
2. The provider holds all required licenses and/or certifications for health and safety.	? Yes			? No
3. The provider possesses satisfactory safety records.				
4. The provider offers services in a safe, clean and healthy environment.				

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**Item 3:**

**Item 4:**

## J. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

All approved SSPs must comply with federal, state and local civil rights protections for program employees *and* participants. It should be noted that providers who are religiously affiliated are prohibited from refusing to hire otherwise qualified tutors or denying students who are not of that religion. SSPs must ensure that instruction is secular, neutral and non-ideological.

SSPs must respond to all the categories below in order to be approved.

<b>J. Compliance with Federal, State and Local Civil Rights Protections</b> ( <i>Limit ½ page</i> )	<b>Quality of Evidence</b>			
	<b>STRONG evidence</b>	<b>MODERATE evidence</b>	<b>LIMITED evidence</b>	<b>NO evidence</b>
1. The provider complies with federal state and local civil rights protections for its employees.				
2. The provider complies with federal state and local civil rights protections for its students.				
3. The provider offers instruction that is secular, neutral and non-ideological.				

***Reviewer Comments:***

**Item 1:**

**Item 2:**

**Item 3:**

## K. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

SSPs are allowed ½ page of text in which to describe any additional considerations they would like you to consider when reviewing this application. *This is an optional section; SSPs should not be disqualified if they do not respond to this section.*

<b>K. Other Considerations</b> ( <i>Limit ½ page</i> )	
Other considerations offered:  *  *  *  *	Comment on the quality of evidence or strength of additional consideration(s) offered:

***Reviewer Comments:***

## OVERALL RECOMMENDATION OF REVIEWER

☐ Approve application as submitted with no additional information or revisions

☐ Request revisions or additional information for the following items:

Letter	Item #(s)	Letter	Item #(s)
A.		F.	
B.		G.	
C.		H.	
D.		I.	
E.		J.	

☐ Disapprove application as submitted

Signature of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_